DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 700 FL 022 543

AUTHOR Fischer, Ruth Overman
TITLE Teaching Writing in the ESL/EFL Classroom: An Annotated Bibliography.
PUB DATE Oct 93
NOTE 8p.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; Classroom Techniques; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Linguistic Theory; *Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Teaching Methods; *Writing (Composition); Writing Attitudes; *Writing Instruction; Writing Processes; *Writing Research; Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography contains 32 citations of journal articles, book chapters, and books that focus on the teaching of writing in English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) and English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) classrooms. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 376 700

Teaching Writing in the ESL/EFL Classroom
An Annotated Bibliography

Ruth Overman Fischer
October 1993

Allaei, S. & Connor, U. (1990). Exploring the dynamics of cross-cultural collaboration in writing classrooms. The Writing Instructor, 10, 19-28.

Recognize the importance of peer response groups in a process-oriented writing class but note the problems in expecting students from different cultures to be able to work in small groups without preparation. Refer to the fields of sociolinguistics and contrastive rhetoric for information teachers need to prepare students to work collaboratively.

Bell, J. (1991). Using peer response groups in ESL writing classes. TESL Canada Journal, 8(2), 65-71.

Supports the use of Peer Response Groups in the ESL writing class and presents a rationale and procedure for group work which provides effective supportive feedback.

Chan, M. (1988). What we already know about teaching ESL writers. English Journal, 77, 84-85.

Asserts that writing teachers, especially those who know and understand the process model of teaching writing, are better equipped to work with ESL writers than they thought they were. Researchers have found the composing processes of native English speakers and ESL students are similar.

Goldstein, L., & Conrad, S. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. TESOL Quarterly, 24, 443-460.

Researches the connection between student participation and negotiation of meaning in writing conferences and improvement in subsequent drafts. Results indicate that students who were actively involved in the negotiation of meaning during the writing conferences used input from the conferences to make improvements in their revised drafts.

Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. TESOL Quarterly, 24, 43-60.

Researches the ways in which four advanced non-native English speaking writers revised argumentative essays written in English and in their native languages. Results showed similar revision strategies across languages as well as student abilities to use

FL022543

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jerry Gebhard
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

both transfer and adaptation of revision strategies from their first language.

Johns, A. (1986). The ESL student and the revision process: Some insights from schema theory. Journal of Basic Writing, 5, 70-80.

Discusses an ESL student's reliance on L1 reading schema when producing written discourse in English and the breakdown in coherence this reliance can cause. Demonstrates ways in which schema theory can facilitate an ESL student's awareness of the expectations that native English speaking readers have of written text.

Johnson, D., & Roen, D. (Eds.). (1989). Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students. White Plains, NY: Longman Inc.

Include eighteen articles about the teaching of writing to ESL students across age groups and proficiency levels. Part I deals with "Settings, Networks, and Concerns", Part II with "Rhetorical Concerns in Writing," and Part III with "Culture, Second Language Writing, and Creativity."

Leki, I. (1992). Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Presents background information on the teaching of writing in English to nonnative speakers, along with principles of second language acquisition, a comparison of ESL and basic writers, a description of the behaviors and attitudes of various ESL writers, and characteristics of the writing behaviors of ESL students.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. Foreign Language Annals, 24, 203-218.

Reports on a survey of 100 ESL students in freshman composition classes to find out what types of teacher feedback was most helpful to them in their writing. Results indicate that students equate good writing with error free writing. Suggests that teachers and students need to discuss what is meant by good writing and how students can make better use of teacher feedback.

Leki, I. (1991). Twenty-five years of contrastive rhetoric: Text analysis and writing pedagogies. TESOL Quarterly, 25, 123-143.

Provides an overview of the research in contrastive rhetoric since Kaplan's study in 1966. Connects this research with

current writing process pedagogy and shows implication for the ESL writing classroom. Provides an extensive bibliography.

MacGowan-Gilhooly, A. (1991). Fluency first: Reversing the traditional ESL sequence. Journal of Basic Writing, 10, 73-87.

Reports on research done at City College of the University of New York on the ESL department's newly implemented whole language approach to reading and writing. The program consists of three levels, which focus respectively on the development of fluency, clarity, and correctness. Grammar and usage questions are addressed within the context of a piece of writing. Results indicate that ESL students are learning to write better using this method.

Mackie, A., & Bullock, C. (1990). Discourse matrix: A practical tool for ESL writing teachers. TESL Canada Journal, 8(1), 67-77.

Basing their work on Kaplan's contrastive rhetoric and Coe's discourse matrix, the authors present a technique which allows teachers to help students discover mismatches between the rhetorical patterns of student texts and those of English.

McAlpine, L. (1989). Teacher-as-reader: Oral feedback on ESL student writing. TESL Canada Journal, 7(1), 62-67.

Asserts that students need feedback on early drafts which recognizes writing as a way of clarifying and communicating meaning and describes a think-aloud procedure which allows teachers to provide this kind of feedback.

Nelson, G., & Murphy, J. (1992). An L2 writing group: Task and social dimensions. Journal of Second Language Writing, 1, 171-190.

Examine peer writing groups to investigate the effectiveness in the way such groups performed along task and social dimensions, categorizing their responses according to the study of language, life general knowledge, life person knowledge, procedure and format. Found that, although students stayed on task when responding to each other's writing, their social interactions often frustrated and disappointed the participants. Suggest that students be trained specifically in supportive response techniques.

Perkins, K. & Brutten, S. (1990). Writing: A holistic or atomistic entity? Journal of Basic Writing, 9, 75-84.

Research supports the assertion among new paradigm process-oriented teachers that ESL students learn to write in a holistic way and efforts to break up writing into discrete focal segments, i. e., content, organization, vocabulary, language usage, and mechanics) is detrimental to their development as writers.

Peyton, J., Staton, J., Richardson, G., & Wolfram, W. (1990). The influence of writing tasks on ESL students' written production. Research in the Teaching of English, 24, 142-171.

Their research showed that the quality of student writing, as measured by quantity, complexity, topic focus, and cohesion, is higher when students are allowed to choose their own topics. Suggest that students be asked to write in a variety of ways (topic, purpose, and audience) and that writing assessment be based on samples of these varieties

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 229-258.

Applies research methodologies in L1 writing for studying the composing process of student writers to studying the composing

processes of unskilled L2 writers. Draws on conclusions of the investigation to describe the needs of these writers.

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. TESOL Quarterly, 25, 407-430.

Reviews the approaches for teaching writing over the previous twenty five years from those which focused on form, both linguistic and rhetorical, to those which consider the issues of process, academic content, and reader expectations. Discusses five controversial issues coming out of the transition to the newer approaches: appropriate topics for ESL writers, attitudes toward authentic student writing, writing academic discourse, contrastive rhetoric, and ways of responding to student writing. Provides an extensive bibliography.

Redicki, P. & Swales, J. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. SYSTEM, 16, 355-365.

Reports that as ESL students become more involved in writing for their disciplines, their reliance on feedback from their language teacher decreases, often because they think that the language teacher knows language but not the rhetorical conventions of their discipline. Because different students respond differently

to different types of feedback, teachers need to become aware of these differences and develop varying feedback strategies.

Roby, J. (1990). The ESL writer and the Kaleidoscope self. The Writing Instructor, 10, 42-50.

Suggests that when ESL students write in English, their construction of self is quite different from that of their L1 self. Coming out of multiple discourses, they need to be encouraged to use English in projects designed to help them investigate their place in the world community on their own terms.

Rodrigues, R. (1985). Moving away from writing-process worship. English Journal, 74(5), 24-27.

Presents reasons that writing teachers have voiced objections to the use of the writing process approach in their classrooms.

Rothschild, D., & Klingenberg, F. (1990). Self and peer evaluation of writing in the interactive ESL classroom: An exploratory study. TESL Canada Journal, 8(1), 52-65.

Submit that ESL students can and should be taught how to evaluate their writing by means of rating scales. Results of their study indicate that ESL student writers benefited from such training by an increased awareness of the criteria of good writing and by their more positive attitudes of themselves as writers.

Santos, T. (1992). Ideology in composition: L1 and ESL. Journal of Second Language Writing, 1, 1-15.

Discusses the reasons that L1 writing process pedagogy has not been widely adopted and adapted in ESL writing programs.

Spack, R. (1984). Invention strategies and the ESL college composition student. TESOL Quarterly, 18, 649-670.

Suggests that teaching ESL composition students ways of using various invention strategies from such areas as classical and modern rhetoric and communication studies would benefit these students in generating ideas for their writing. Presents invention procedures used in a freshman composition class and the invention notes of one ESL student.

Watson, C. (1982). The use and abuse of models in the ESL writing class. TESOL Quarterly, 16, 5-14.

Explores the way in which models of expected writing have been used and the validity of the claims that state that these models are useful. Suggest that a process-oriented approach which

integrates reading and writing might prove more beneficial than a strict models approach.

White, R. (1987). Approaches to writing. In M. Long & J. Richards (Eds.), Methodology in TESOL: A book of readings (pp. 259-266). New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Asserts that writing is as important as listening, speaking, or reading and can be used for assessment to provide a different kind of classroom activity, including quiet time for the teacher and feedback on how well students understand current material. Students should be provided with writing activities appropriate to their level: manipulating sentence parts (Stage I), parallel writing activities (Stage II), sentence and paragraph construction (Stage III) and complete compositions (Stage IV).

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16, 195-209.

Discusses ways in which a student uses writing to generate, clarify, and organize her ideas in a piece of writing. Suggests that such discovery writing is essential in order for the student to find out what she really wants to communicate.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing process of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. TESOL Quarterly, 17, 165-187.

Studies the composing processes of six advanced ESL writing students to determine ways in which these students used writing to discover and clarify meaning. Results indicate that these writers generate ideas before looking at clarification and language use. Calls into question any writing pedagogy which would not allow such exploration through composing.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 79-101.

Explores the ways in which ESL teachers respond to student writing and notes that their responses are similar to those or L1 writing teachers. Reports that these responses treat initial student drafts as final and apply a prescriptive grammar-focused stance which fails to consider the developmental nature of the composing process. Stresses the need for teachers to respond to student drafts in ways appropriate to the development of a piece of writing.

Zamel, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 697-715.

Reports on classroom research which focuses on the ways writing pedagogy affects students' success in writing in English.

Findings suggest that student are more successful in their development as writers a situation in which a writing process pedagogy, as opposed to the traditional product-oriented model, has been implemented. Encourages teachers to become researchers within their classrooms.

Zamel, V. (1990). Through students' eyes: The experiences of three ESL writers. Journal of Basic Writing, 9, 83-98.

Investigates the experience of three male ESL writing students in two separate writing courses. Notes that the affective aspects of the students with respect to themselves as writers differed in the two learning environments, to their detriment. Asserts that teachers need to be aware of the way their students' beliefs, expectations, and perspectives influence their writing performance.

Zamel, V. (1992). Writing one's way into reading. TESOL Quarterly, 26, 463-485.

Asserts that the transmission model of reading does not allow students to interact with written text in a meaning-making exploratory manner. Argues that writing as a heuristic device, provides students with ways of connecting with and comprehending what they are reading.